

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KEITH PAUL BIRD,
Plaintiff(s),

v.

JULIE WILLIAMS, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00120-JAD-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 53]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery. Docket No. 53.¹ Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 62. No reply was filed. The motion is properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

Plaintiff's motion indicates that responses to the disputed discovery were untimely and asks the Court to "review in camera" the subject documents to make a ruling on various objections. Docket No. 53 at 3; *see also id.* at 4-5. Plaintiff also seeks, without elaboration, other discovery-related relief. *Id.* at 3. By his own admission, Plaintiff then "[d]igresses" into rehashing the allegations in the pleadings and lamenting as to accusations of bad behavior. *See id.* at 4. The motion does not provide meaningful argument on any of the discovery disputes at issue.

Plaintiff's motion misunderstands the Court's role in addressing discovery disputes. Discovery is meant to proceed with limited involvement of the Court. *Cardoza v. Bloomin' Brands*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015). Parties are not permitted to file a motion to compel indicating simply that there are disagreements on discovery and that the Court should resolve them; a discovery motion must provide actual argument as to each of those disagreements. *E.g., Lux v. Buchanan*, 2024 WL 1598805, at *1 (D. Nev. Apr. 12, 2024). Moreover, asking the

¹ The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants, particularly those who are prisoners bringing civil rights claims. *Blaisdell v. Frappiea*, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013).

1 Court to conduct an *in camera* review does not allow a party to bypass the basic requirements for
2 motion practice. *E.g., Garcia v. Serv. Emps. Int’l Union*, 2018 WL 6566563, at *5 (D. Nev. Sept.
3 6, 2018) (“*In camera* review of documents is disfavored and does not replace the standard
4 adversarial process”).

5 In short, the pending motion to compel does not sufficiently address the issues in dispute.
6 Accordingly, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: April 7, 2025

9
10 
11 _____
12 Nancy J. Koppe
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28